

REMARKS

This Amendment is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed on August 17, 2004. Pending in the present application were claims 1-18. In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 6, and 11-18 were rejected, while claims 4, 5, and 7-10 were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form. With this Amendment, claims 3, 4, and 6 are canceled without prejudice; claims 1, 2, 5, 7-15, 17, and 18 are amended, and new claims 19-26 are added. The present application containing claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-26 is now in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6, and 11-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Ashmore, Jr., U.S. Patent No. 5,818,294. Claims 4, 5, and 7-10 were rejected as being dependent upon a rejected independent claim. With this Amendment, independent claim 1 is amended to include all the elements of claim 4, including the elements of claim 3 from which claim 4 depended. Dependent claim 7 is amended into independent form to include all the elements of claims 1 and 6, from which claim 7 had depended. Because of these amendments, claims 3, 4, and 6 are canceled without prejudice. Also with this Amendment, new claims 19-26 depending from newly independent claim 7 are added. Accordingly, independent claim 1 (and its dependent claims 2, 5, and 11-18) and independent claim 7 (and its dependent claims 8-10 and 19-26) are all allowable over the prior art of record, as was indicated by the Examiner.

Claim 6 was objected to for reciting "said current source", when claim 6 should have read "said second current source". With this Amendment, claim 7 (which now incorporates claim 6) now recites "the second current source". This objection should be removed. Also, throughout the claims, all occurrences of the phrase "the said" have been grammatically corrected to "the". Claim 18 was amended to place it in proper Markush form.

Finally, claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Office Action at paragraph 3 notes that claim 12 is not understood because "[i]t appears to define temperature independence even though the second current is not compensation for the first current." As originally filed, claim 12 included the clause, "said reference current


does depend on the said temperature." (Emphasis added). However, the Preliminary Amendment mailed on October 10, 2003 accidentally modified this phrase to read that the "reference current **does not depend** on the said temperature". (Emphasis added). The present Amendment corrects this error, such that claim 12 embodies a voltage source in which the variations of the second current as a function of temperature do not compensate for the variations of the first current, so that the reference current generated by summing the first and second currents does depend on temperature. See paragraphs 70-72. With the present Amendment, this rejection should be withdrawn.

In sum, the application containing pending claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-26 is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below if such a call would in any way facilitate allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

KINNEY & LANGE, P.A.

Date: 11/17/04

By: 
Alan M. Koenck, Reg. No. 43,724
THE KINNEY & LANGE BUILDING
312 South Third Street
Minneapolis, MN 55415-1002
Telephone: (612) 339-1863
Fax: (612) 339-6580

DMK:bs